arXiv:0811.1349v1 [math.CA] 9 Nov 2008

A UNIFORM ESTIMATE FOR FOURIER RESTRICTION TO SIMPLE CURVES

DANIEL M. OBERLIN

Abstract. We prove a uniform Fourier extension-restriction estimate for a certain class of curves in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

1. Introduction

Let γ be a curve in $\mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$\gamma(t) = \Big(t, \frac{t^2}{2}, \dots, \frac{t^{d-1}}{(d-1)!}, \phi(t)\Big) \tag{1.1}$$

where $\phi \in C^{(d+2)}(a,b)$ and $\phi^{(j)}(t) > 0$ for $t \in (a,b)$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, d+2$. Such curves are termed *simple* in [5]. Write $\omega(t)$ for $\phi^{(d)}(t)$. The purpose of this note is to prove a uniform Fourier extension-restriction theorem for affine arclength measure on curves (1.1):

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose λ is the measure on γ given by $d\lambda = \omega(t)^{2/(d^2+d)}dt$. If $1 \le p < d+2$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{d(d+1)}{2}\frac{1}{q} = 1$, then there is $C(p,d)$ such that the following estimate holds:*

$$\|\widehat{f\,d\lambda}\|_q \le C(p,d)\, \|f\|_{L^p(\lambda)}.$$

If $d = 2$ this is just the theorem in [7], a result originally established in slightly more generality, but with a more complicated proof, by Sjölin in [9]. This note is the result of an attempt to apply the method from [7] in higher dimensions. Theorem 1.1, which is an immediate consequence of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 below, is somewhat analogous to the result of [4] on two fronts: it is a direct consequence of a geometric inequality (Theorem 1.2 here) combined with a fairly simple argument (Theorem 1.3 here), and its range of exponents p is the (probably suboptimal) range obtained by Christ [3]. For a better range of p when ω satisfies a certain auxiliary condition, see Theorem 1.1 in [2]. For some of the history of the problem of restricting Fourier transforms to curves, see [1].

Date: October, 2008.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B10.

Key words and phrases. Fourier transforms of measures on curves, Fourier restriction problem, affine arclength measure.

The author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0552041.

Theorem 1.2. *There exists $C = C(d)$ such that the estimate*

$$\int_a^b \Big(\int_{\{t_1 \le t_i < b\}} \chi_F\big(\gamma(t_1)+\cdots+\gamma(t_d)\big) \Big[\prod_{i=2}^d \omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)} dt_2 \cdots dt_d \Big)^{(d+2)/2} \omega(t_1)^{2/(d^2+d)}\, dt_1 \le C(d)\, m_d(F) \tag{1.2}$$

holds for Borel $F \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

The next result is Theorem 7 in [8].

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that λ is a nonnegative Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the inequality*

$$\int \Big(\int_{\{\tau(y_1) \le \tau(y_i)\}} \chi_F(y_1+y_2+\cdots+y_m)\, d\lambda(y_2) \cdots d\lambda(y_m) \Big)^{\frac{m+2}{2}} d\lambda(y_1) \le c\, m_d(F)$$

for some nonnegative integer $m \ge 3$, some real-valued Borel function τ on supp(λ), and all Borel $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the adjoint restriction estimate

$$\|\widehat{f d\lambda}\|_q \le C(c,p)\ \|f\|_{L^p(\lambda)}$$

holds whenever $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{m(m+1)}{2}\frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $1 \le p < m+2$.

The next section contains the proof of Theorem 1.2, while §3 contains the proofs of certain lemmas used in §2.

Acknowledgment: The author would like to express his gratitude to Jong-Guk Bak and Andreas Seeger: this note is a byproduct of the collaboration that led to [1] and [2].

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

The idea for the proof of Theorem 1.2, from [8], is to regard (1.2) as an $L^{(d+2)/2,1} \to L^{(d+2)/2}$ estimate for a certain operator T and to establish (1.2) by establishing the dual $L^{(d+2)/d} \to L^{(d+2)/d,\infty}$ estimate for T^*. Let $J(t_1, \ldots, t_d)$ be the absolute value of the Jacobian determinant for the map

$$(t_1, \ldots t_d) \mapsto \gamma(t_1) + \cdots + \gamma(t_d).$$

Then

$$\langle f, T^* g \rangle = \langle Tf, g \rangle =$$

$$\int_a^b \Big(\int_{\{t_1 \le t_i < b\}} f\big(\gamma(t_1)+\cdots+\gamma(t_d)\big) \Big[\prod_{i=2}^d \omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)} dt_2 \cdots dt_d \Big) g(t_1)\, \omega(t_1)^{2/(d^2+d)}\, dt_1 =$$

$$\int_{\{a < t_1 \le t_i < b\}} \Big(\frac{g(t_1)}{J(t_1, \ldots, t_d)} \Big[\prod_{i=1}^d \omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)} \Big) f\big(\gamma(t_1)+\cdots+\gamma(t_d)\big) J(t_1, \ldots, t_d)\, dt_d \cdots dt_1$$

so that the desired $L^{(d+2)/d} \to L^{(d+2)/d,\infty}$ estimate for nonnegative g,

$$\lambda^{(d+2)/d} m_d\{T^* g \ge \lambda\} \le C(d) \int_a^b g(t_1)^{(d+2)/d} \omega(t_1)^{2/(d^2+d)}\, dt_1 \ (\lambda > 0),$$

will follow from the estimate

$$\lambda^{(d+2)/2}\int \chi_{\widetilde{E}}(t_1,\dots,t_d)\,J(t_1,\dots,t_d)\,dt_d\cdots dt_1 \le C(d)\int_a^b g(t_1)^{(d+2)/d}\,\omega(t_1)^{2/(d^2+d)}\,dt_1, \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\widetilde{E}=\Big\{(t_1,\dots,t_d): a<t_1\le\cdots\le t_d<b,\ \frac{g(t_1)}{J(t_1,\dots,t_d)}\Big[\prod_{i=1}^{d}\omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)}\ge\lambda\Big\}.$$

(The change of variables implicit in this argument can be justified as in [6], p. 549.) By absorbing λ into g we can assume $\lambda=1$. Thus (2.1) will follow from integrating the inequality

$$\int \chi_{\widetilde{E}}(t_1,\dots,t_d)\,J(t_1,\dots,t_d)\,dt_d\cdots dt_2 \le C(d)\,g(t_1)^{(d+2)/d}\,\omega(t_1)^{2/(d^2+d)} \tag{2.2}$$

with respect to t_1. Lemma 2.3 in [2] shows that there is a nonnegative function $\psi=\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)$ supported in $[t_1,t_d]$ such that

$$J(t_1,\dots,t_d)=\int_{t_1}^{t_d}\omega(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du \tag{2.3}$$

and so (2.2) will follow from the inequality

$$\int \chi_{\widetilde{E}}(t_1,\dots,t_d)\,J(t_1,\dots,t_d)\,dt_d\cdots dt_2 \le C(d)\,c^{(d+2)/d}\,\omega(t_1)^{2/(d^2+d)}, \tag{2.4}$$

to hold for $c>0$ and $t_1\in(a,b)$, where now

$$\widetilde{E}=\Big\{(t_1,\dots,t_d): a<t_1\le\cdots\le t_d<b,\ \int_{t_1}^{t_d}\omega(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du\le c\Big[\prod_{i=1}^{d}\omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)}\Big\}.$$

Homogeneity allows absorbing c into ω, so we can assume $c=1$. With $t_1>a$ fixed, then, and with

$$E=\Big\{(t_2,\dots,t_d): t_1\le t_2\le\cdots\le t_d<b,\ J(t_1,\dots,t_d)\le\Big[\prod_{i=1}^{d}\omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)}\Big\}, \tag{2.5}$$

inequality (2.4), and so (1.2), will follow from

$$\int \chi_E(t_2,\dots,t_d)\Big[\prod_{i=2}^{d}\omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)}\,dt_d\cdots dt_2\le C(d). \tag{2.6}$$

To begin the proof of (2.6), let $J\subset\mathbb{Z}$ be an interval of integers such that $\{2^j: j\in J\}$ is the set of dyadic values assumed by ω on (a,b). For each $j\in J$, choose $a_j\in(a,b)$ such that $\omega(a_j)=2^j$. If J has a least element, say $j_{\min}$, we let $a_{j_{\min}-1}=a$ and append $j_{\min}-1$ to J. If J has a greatest element, we make a similar accommodation. Then, writing $I_j=[a_j,a_{j+1})\cap(a,b)$, we obtain a partition $\{I_j\}_{j\in J}$ of (a,b).

Now, with $t_1 \in (a,b)$ fixed, say $t_1 \in I_{j_1}$, with E as in (2.5), and for integers $j_2 \leq j_3 \leq \cdots \leq j_d$ in J with $j_2 \geq j_1$, we set

$$E_{j_2 \cdots j_d} \doteq \{(t_2, \dots, t_d) \in E : (t_2, \dots, t_d) \in I_{j_2} \times \cdots \times I_{j_d}\}.$$

The desired estimate (2.6) will follow from

$$\sum_{j_2 \geq j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_d \geq j_{d-1}} \left(2^{j_2 + \cdots + j_d}\right)^{2/(d^2+d)} m_{d-1}\left(E_{j_2 \cdots j_d}\right) \leq C(d). \tag{2.7}$$

To establish (2.7) it is enough to show that, for each $(j_2, \dots, j_d)$ figuring in the sum in (2.7), we have

$$\left(2^{j_2 + \cdots + j_d}\right)^{1/(d-1)} m_{d-1}\left(E_{j_2 \cdots j_d}\right)^{d/2} \leq C(d) \left(2^{j_1 + j_2 + \cdots + j_d}\right)^{2/(d^2+d)}. \tag{2.8}$$

In fact, some algebra shows that (2.8) is equivalent to

$$\left(2^{j_2 + \cdots + j_d}\right)^{2/(d^2+d)} m_{d-1}\left(E_{j_2 \cdots j_d}\right) \leq C(d)\, 2^{4j_1/(d^3+d^2)} 2^{-4(j_2 + \cdots + j_d)/[(d^3+d^2)(d-1)]}$$

and so, given (2.8), (2.7) follows by summing a geometric series.

Moving towards the proof of (2.8), fix $(j_2, \dots, j_d)$. In what follows we will often write $j(l)$ instead of j_l. Let $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots p_{k-1}$ be the indices i in $\{1, 2, \dots, d-1\}$ for which $j(i+1) - j(i) \geq 2$ and set $p_0 = 0$ and $p_k = d$. Define $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k$ by $\ell_n = p_n - p_{n-1} - 1$ $(n = 1, \dots, k)$, and observe that $\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_k = d - k$. Then

$$\{j(1), j(2), \dots, j(d)\} =$$
$$\{j(p_0+1), j(p_0+2), \dots, j(p_1); j(p_1+1), \dots, j(p_2); \dots; j(p_{k-1}+1), \dots, j(p_k)\}$$

where if $j(i)$ and $j(i+1)$ are separated by a semicolon then $j(i+1) - j(i) \geq 2$ and otherwise $0 \leq j(i+1) - j(i) \leq 1$. Next we construct k subintervals J_n of (a,b) by setting, for $n = 1, \dots, k$,

$$J_n = I_{j(p_{n-1}+1)} \cup I_{j(p_{n-1}+2)} \cup \cdots \cup I_{j(p_n)} \tag{2.9}$$

so that, recalling the definition of I_j, the endpoints of J_n are $c_n \doteq a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)}$ and $d_n \doteq a_{j(p_n)+1}$. Note that $c_1 < d_1 < c_2 < d_2 < \cdots < c_k < d_k$ (see (2.11) below) and that if $(t_2, \dots, t_d) \in E_{j_2 \dots j_d}$ then

$$c_n \leq t_{p_{n-1}+1} \leq t_{p_{n-1}+2} \leq \cdots \leq t_{p_n} \leq d_n. \tag{2.10}$$

We will need the facts that if $n = 2, \dots k$, then

$$d_{n-1} \leq a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)-1} < c_n \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$c_n - a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)-1} \gtrsim d_n - c_n. \tag{2.12}$$

(Through this note, the constants implied by symbols like $\lesssim$ can easily be checked to depend only on d.) To see (2.12), note that because $\omega(a_j) = 2^j$ and ω' is nondecreasing we have

$$(a_{j+1} - a_j)\, \omega'(a_j) \leq \int_{a_j}^{a_{j+1}} \omega'(u)\, du = 2^j = 2 \int_{a_{j-1}}^{a_j} \omega'(u)\, du \leq 2\, (a_j - a_{j-1})\, \omega'(a_j)$$

so that $(a_{j+1}-a_j) \le 2\,(a_j - a_{j-1})$ and therefore

$$(a_{j+p} - a_{j+p-1}) \le 2^p\,(a_j - a_{j-1}). \tag{2.13}$$

Now, by definition of p_{n-1}, $j(p_{n-1})+1 \le j(p_{n-1}+1)-1$, and so $a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)-1}$ lies between $d_{n-1} = a_{j(p_{n-1})+1}$ and $c_n = a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)}$ in the sense of (2.11). Also, according to (2.9), $J_n = (c_n, d_n)$ is (up to endpoints) the union of no more than d intervals $I_j = [a_j, a_{j+1})$. By choice of the p_n, each interval but the first in the union in (2.9) is either identical to or contiguous to the one on its left. Since the first of these intervals is $(a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)}, a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)+1})$, (2.13) implies (2.12).

We now outline the proof of (2.8), beginning with a lemma (the proofs of the lemmas will be given in §3):

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose* $t_1 < \cdots < t_d$ *and* $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \subset (t_i, t_{i+1})$. *Write* $\Delta_i = \beta_i - \alpha_i$ *and suppose*

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} c_i\, \chi_{(\alpha_i, \beta_i)}$$

where $c_i \ge 0$. *Fix* $p \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$. *Suppose*

$$\{e_i : i = 1, 2, \dots d-1, i \ne p\} = \{1, 2, \dots, d-2\}.$$

Then

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_d} f(u)\, \psi(u; t_1, \dots, t_d)\, du \gtrsim c_p\, \Delta_p^{d-1} \prod_{\substack{1 \le i \le d-1 \\ i \ne p}} \Delta_i^{e_i}.$$

With t_1 and $j_2, \dots, j_d$ fixed and with $(t_2, \dots, t_d) \in E_{j_2 \cdots j_d}$, we will apply Lemma 2.1 to a collection $\mathcal{I}$ of intervals (α_i, β_i) specified as follows: for $n = 1, \dots, k$ and $i = p_{n-1}+1, \dots, p_n - 1$, the ℓ_n intervals (t_i, t_{i+1}) will be in $\mathcal{I}$; additionally, for $n = 2, \dots, k$, the intervals

$$\tilde{J}_n \doteq (a_{j(p_{n-1}+1)-1}, c_n) \subset (t_{p_{n-1}}, t_{p_{n-1}+1}) \tag{2.14}$$

will be in $\mathcal{I}$ (we set $\tilde{J}_1 = \emptyset$). Observe that there are integers $m_1 \le m_2 \le \cdots \le m_k$ such that

$$\omega \sim 2^{m_n} \text{ on } \tilde{J}_n \cup \Big(\cup_{i=p_{n-1}+1}^{p_n - 1} (t_i, t_{i+1}) \Big) \doteq \mathcal{J}_n \ (n = 1, \dots, k). \tag{2.15}$$

(This is true because, according to (2.10), $\mathcal{J}_n$ is contained in the union of at most $\ell_n + 1 \le d$ contiguous intervals I_j, and $\omega \sim 2^j$ on I_j.) Then (2.8) can be written

$$2^{[\ell_1 m_1 + (\ell_2+1)m_2 + \cdots + (\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d-1)} m_{d-1}\big(E_{j_2 \cdots j_d}\big)^{d/2} \lesssim 2^{2[(\ell_1+1)m_1 + (\ell_2+1)m_2 + \cdots + (\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d^2+d)}. \tag{2.16}$$

Similarly, the inequality

$$J(t_1, \dots, t_d) \le \Big[\prod_{i=1}^{d} \omega(t_i)\Big]^{2/(d^2+d)}$$

in (2.5) implies

$$J(t_1,\dots,t_d) \lesssim 2^{2[(\ell_1+1)m_1+\cdots+(\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d^2+d)}. \tag{2.17}$$

Now, as we will see below, Lemma 2.1, (2.15), (2.17), and

$$J(t_1,\dots,t_d) = \int_{t_1}^{t_d} \omega(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du$$

will yield certain estimates of the form

$$2^{m_n}\Delta_p^{d-1} \prod_{\substack{1\le i\le d-1 \\ i\ne p}} \Delta_i^{e_i} \lesssim 2^{2[(\ell_1+1)m_1+(\ell_2+1)m_2+\cdots+(\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d^2+d)} \tag{2.18}$$

when $(\alpha_p,\beta_p)\subset \mathcal{J}_n$. A weighted geometric mean of these estimates (2.18) will give

$$2^{[\ell_1 m_1+(\ell_2+1)m_2+\cdots+(\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d-1)}\, W_1^{d/(\ell_1+1)} \prod_{n=2}^{k} \Big(\rho_n^{(d+\ell_n)/2} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\Big) \lesssim 2^{2[(\ell_1+1)m_1+(\ell_2+1)m_2+\cdots+(\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d^2+d)}, \tag{2.19}$$

where ρ_n is the length of $\tilde{J}_n$ and with the W_n's given by

$$W_n = W(t_{p_{n-1}+1},\dots,t_{p_n})$$

where, for $s_1\le\cdots\le s_m$,

$$W(s_1,\dots,s_m) = \sup\Big\{\prod_{i=1}^{m-1}(s_{i+1}-s_i)^{e_i} : \{e_1,\dots,e_{m-1}\} = \{1,\dots,m-1\}\Big\}.$$

Lemma 2.3 below will allow the choice of $(t_2,\dots,t_d)\in E_{j_2\cdots j_d}$ such that

$$m_{d-1}\big(E_{j_2\cdots j_d}\big)^{d/2} \lesssim W_1^{d/(\ell_1+1)} \prod_{n=2}^{k} \Big(\rho_n^{(d+\ell_n)/2} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\Big). \tag{2.20}$$

With (2.19) this will yield (2.16).

To give the details missing from the argument in the preceding paragraph we will need a lemma whose statement requires the introduction of some more notation: $\mathcal{A}_{d-1}$ will stand for the convex hull in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ of the set of all permutations of the $(d-1)$-tuple $(1,2,\dots,d-1)$. Recall that $\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_k+k-1 = d-1$. If $\ell_1>0$, $\mathcal{A}'_{d-1}$ is defined to be the collection of all permutations of $(d-1)$-tuples

$$(d-1)\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\frac{1}{\ell_2+1}(1,\dots,\ell_2);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k);\underbrace{\frac12,\cdots,\frac12}_{k-1\text{ times}}\Big).$$

Note that if $k = 1$, then $\mathcal{A}'_{d-1} = \mathcal{A}_{d-1}$. For $k \geq 2$, define $\mathcal{A}''_{d-1}$ to be the collection of all permutations of $(d-1)$-tuples

$$(d-1)\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1+1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k);\underbrace{\frac{1}{2},\cdots,\frac{1}{2}}_{k-2\text{ times}};1\Big).$$

(To simplify the notation, and since no confusion will result from doing so, we surpress the dependence of $\mathcal{A}'_{d-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}''_{d-1}$ on k and the ℓ_n's.)

Lemma 2.2. *The inclusions* $\mathcal{A}'_{d-1}$, $\mathcal{A}''_{d-1} \subset \mathcal{A}_{d-1}$ *hold.*

Moving towards (2.19), fix $n' \in \{2,\dots,k\}$. We will show that

$$2^{m_{n'}} \prod_{n=1}^{k} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)} \Big(\prod_{\substack{1\leq n\leq k\\ n\neq 1,n'}} \rho_n^{(d-1)/2}\Big) \rho_{n'}^{d-1} \lesssim 2^{2[(\ell_1+1)m_1+\cdots+(\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d^2+d)}. \tag{2.21}$$

Recall the definitions of the intervals (α_i,β_i), whose lengths Δ_i are the numbers ρ_n $(n = 2,\dots,k)$ along with the numbers $t_{i+1} - t_i$ for $i = p_{n-1}+1,\dots,p_n - 1$ and $n = 1,\dots,k$. Since

$$W_n = \prod_{i=p_{n-1}+1}^{p_n-1} (t_{i+1}-t_i)^{e_i^n},$$

for some choice of $\{e_i^n\}$ with

$$\{e_i^n\}_{i=p_{n-1}+1}^{p_n-1} = \{1,\dots,\ell_n\},$$

it follows that

$$\prod_{n=1}^{k} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)} \Big(\prod_{\substack{1\leq n\leq k\\ n\neq 1,n'}} \rho_n^{(d-1)/2}\Big) \rho_{n'}^{d-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \Delta_i^{\sigma(i)}, \tag{2.22}$$

where the vector $\sigma = \big(\sigma(i)\big)$ is in $\mathcal{A}''_{d-1}$ and where, if i_0 is the index for which $(\alpha_{i_0},\beta_{i_0}) = \widetilde{J}_{n'}$, then $\sigma(i_0) = d-1$ and so $\Delta_{i_0}^{\sigma(i_0)} = \rho_{n'}^{d-1}$. By Lemma 2.2, the vector σ is a convex combination

$$\sigma = \sum_q \lambda_q \tau_q \tag{2.23}$$

of vectors $\tau_q = \big(\tau_q(i)\big)$, each of which is a permutation of $(1,\dots,d-1)$. Further, since $\sigma(i_0) = d-1$, we have $\tau_q(i_0) = d-1$ for each q. Now it follows from Lemma 2.1 that if the c_i's are nonnegative, then

$$c_{i_0}\,\Delta_{i_0}^{d-1} \prod_{\substack{1\leq i\leq d-1\\ i\neq i_0}} \Delta_i^{\tau_q(i)} \lesssim \int_{t_1}^{t_d} \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} c_i\,\chi_{(\alpha_i,\beta_i)}(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du \tag{2.24}$$

for each q. From (2.22), (2.23), and (2.24) it then follows that

$$c_{i_0}\prod_{n=1}^{k} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\Big(\prod_{\substack{1\le n\le k\\ n\neq 1,n'}}\rho_n^{(d-1)/2}\Big)\rho_{n'}^{d-1}\lesssim\int_{t_1}^{t_d}\sum_{i=1}^{d-1}c_i\,\chi_{(\alpha_i,\beta_i)}(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du.$$

Since (2.15) implies that $\omega\sim 2^{m_{n'}}$ on $\widetilde{J}_{n'}=(\alpha_{i_0},\beta_{i_0})$, we have

(2.25)

$$2^{m_{n'}}\prod_{n=1}^{k} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\Big(\prod_{\substack{1\le n\le k\\ n\neq 1,n'}}\rho_n^{(d-1)/2}\Big)\rho_{n'}^{d-1}\lesssim\int_{t_1}^{t_d}2^{m_{n'}}\chi_{\widetilde{J}_{n'}}(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du\lesssim$$

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_d}\omega(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du=J(t_1,\dots,t_d)\lesssim 2^{2[(\ell_1+1)m_1+\cdots+(\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d^2+d)}$$

by (2.3) and (2.17). This is (2.21). Analogous to (2.21) we will also need, in the case $\ell_1>0$, the estimate

$$2^{m_1}W_1^{(d-1)/\ell_1}\prod_{n=2}^{k}W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\prod_{n=2}^{k}\rho_n^{(d-1)/2}\lesssim 2^{2[(\ell_1+1)m_1+\cdots+(\ell_k+1)m_k]/(d^2+d)}. \tag{2.26}$$

As before,

$$W_1^{(d-1)/\ell_1}\prod_{n=2}^{k}W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\prod_{n=2}^{k}\rho_n^{(d-1)/2}=\prod_{i=1}^{d-1}\Delta_i^{\sigma(i)}$$

where now σ is in $\mathcal{A}'_{d-1}$. With $\sigma=\sum_q\lambda_q\tau_q$ as in (2.23), Lemma 2.1 gives

$$2^{m_1}\prod_{i=1}^{d-1}\Delta_i^{\tau_q(i)}\lesssim\int_{t_1}^{t_d}\sum_{1}^{d-1}2^{m_1}\,\chi_{(\alpha_i,\beta_i)}(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du$$

for each q. This leads, as before, to

$$2^{m_1}W_1^{(d-1)/\ell_1}\prod_{n=2}^{k}W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\prod_{n=2}^{k}\rho_n^{(d-1)/2}\lesssim\int_{t_1}^{t_d}\sum_{1}^{d-1}2^{m_1}\,\chi_{(\alpha_i,\beta_i)}(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du.$$

Since $\omega\gtrsim 2^{m_1}$ on $[t_1,t_d]$, (2.26) follows as in (2.25).

Now (2.19) will follow by considering a particular weighted geometric mean of the estimates (2.26) and (2.21). In fact, given the computations

$$\frac{\ell_1}{d-1}+\frac{\ell_2+1}{d-1}+\frac{\ell_3+1}{d-1}+\cdots+\frac{\ell_k+1}{d-1}=1,$$

$$\frac{d-1}{\ell_1}\frac{\ell_1}{d-1}+\frac{d-1}{\ell_1+1}\Big(\frac{\ell_2+1}{d-1}+\frac{\ell_3+1}{d-1}+\cdots+\frac{\ell_k+1}{d-1}\Big)=\frac{d}{\ell_1+1},$$

and

$$(d-1)\frac{\ell_{n'}+1}{d-1}+\frac{d-1}{2}\Big(1-\frac{\ell_{n'}+1}{d-1}\Big)=\frac{d+\ell_{n'}}{2},\ n'=2,\dots,k,$$

(2.19) is an immediate consequence of (2.21) and (2.26).

Now the proof of (2.16) will be complete when we have explained how to choose $(t_2, \dots, t_d) \in E_{j_2 \dots j_d}$ so that (2.20) holds. We will need another lemma and some more notation: recall that

$$c_1 < d_1 < c_2 < d_2 < \cdots < c_k < d_k.$$

Let $\delta_n = d_n - c_n$. Recall that $1 \le p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_k = d$, $p_0 = 0$, $\ell_n = p_n - p_{n-1} - 1$, and that

$$c_n \le t_{p_{n-1}+1} < \cdots < t_{p_n} \le d_n \tag{2.27}$$

for $n = 1, \dots k$. With $t_{p_{n-1}+1} \in [c_n, d_n)$, write $\mathbf{t_n}$ for an ℓ_n-tuple $(t_{p_{n-1}+2}, \dots, t_{p_n})$ satisfying (2.27), and $\mathbf{t}$ for the $(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_k = d-k)$-tuple $(\mathbf{t_1}, \dots, \mathbf{t_k})$.

Lemma 2.3. *The inequality*

$$m_{d-k}\big(\{\mathbf{t} : W_1^{d/(\ell_1+1)} \prod_{n=2}^{k} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)} \le \mu\}\big) \lesssim \mu^{2/d} \prod_{n=2}^{k} \delta_n^{\ell_n/d}$$

holds for $\mu > 0$.

Writing

$$(t_2, \dots, t_d) = (t_{p_1+1}, \dots, t_{p_{k-1}+1}; \mathbf{t})$$

with $\mathbf{t}$ as above, we use (2.27) to choose

$$(t'_{p_1+1}, \dots, t'_{p_{k-1}+1}) \in \prod_{n=2}^{k} [c_n, d_n]$$

such that

$$m_{d-k}\big(\{\mathbf{t} : (t'_{p_1+1}, \dots, t'_{p_{k-1}+1}; \mathbf{t}) \in E_{j_2 \cdots j_d}\}\big) \ge \frac{m_{d-1}(E_{j_2 \cdots j_d})}{\prod_{n=2}^{k} \delta_n}.$$

Let $c_1(d) > 0$ be sufficiently small. Then if $\mu > 0$ is such that

$$\mu^{2/d} \prod_{n=2}^{k} \delta_n^{\ell_n/d} = c_1(d) \frac{m_{d-1}(E_{j_2 \cdots j_d})}{\prod_{n=2}^{k} \delta_n},$$

it follows from Lemma 2.3 that there is

$$(t_2, \dots, t_d) \in E_{j_2 \cdots j_d}$$

such that

$$W_1^{d/(\ell_1+1)} \prod_{n=2}^{k} W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)} > \mu = c_2(d) \frac{m_{d-1}(E_{j_2 \cdots j_d})^{d/2}}{\prod_{n=2}^{k} \delta_n^{(d+\ell_n)/2}}.$$

Recalling that ρ_n is the length of $\tilde{J}_n$, so that $\delta_n = d_n - c_n \lesssim \rho_n$ by (2.14) and (2.12), (2.20) follows.

3. Proofs of lemmas

Proof of Lemma 2.1. The proof is by induction on d and, since $\psi(u;t_1,t_2)=\chi_{[t_1,t_2]}(u)$, the case $d=2$ is clear. Fix $p\in\{1,\dots,d-1\}$ and then a choice of $\{e_i\}_{i\neq p}$ so that $\{e_i\}_{i\neq p}=\{1,\dots,d-2\}$. Let q satisfy $e_q=1$. We will give the argument in the case $q<p$, the case $q>p$ being similar. Let m_i be the midpoint of $[\alpha_i,\beta_i]$. Define intervals $I_1,\dots I_{d-1}$ and $J_1,\dots J_{d-1}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&I_j=(\alpha_i,m_i),\ J_i=(m_i,\beta_i)\ \text{if}\, i<q,\\ &I_q=(\alpha_q,m_q),\ J_q=\emptyset,\\ &I_i=(m_i,\beta_i),\ J_i=(\alpha_i,m_i)\ \text{if}\, i>q.\end{aligned}$$

We use the identity

$$\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)=\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\cdots\int_{t_{d-1}}^{t_d}\psi(u;s_1,\dots,s_{d-1})\,ds_1\cdots ds_{d-1},$$

a consequence of the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [2], and the fact that $\psi(u,s_1,\dots,s_{d-1})$ is supported on $[s_1,s_{d-1}]$ to write

(3.1)
$$\int_{t_1}^{t_d}f(u)\,\psi(u;t_1,\dots,t_d)\,du=\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\cdots\int_{t_{d-1}}^{t_d}\int_{s_1}^{s_{d-1}}f(u)\,\psi(u;s_1,\dots,s_{d-1})\,du\,ds_1\cdots ds_{d-1}.$$

Then

$$(3.1)\geq\int_{I_1}\cdots\int_{I_{d-1}}\int_{s_1}^{s_{d-1}}\sum_{\substack{1\leq i\leq d-1\\ i\neq q}}c_i\,\chi_{J_i}(u)\,\psi(u;s_1,\dots,s_{d-1})\,du\,ds_1\cdots ds_{d-1}.$$

Now if $s_i\in I_i$ for $i=1,\dots,d-1$ then $J_i\subset(s_i,s_{i+1})$ if $i<q$ and $J_i\subset(s_{i-1},s_i)$ if $i>q$. Thus, assuming the lemma for $d-1$ and noting that $\{e_i-1\}_{i\neq p,q}=\{1,\dots,d-3\}$, it follows that

$$\int_{s_1}^{s_{d-1}}\sum_{\substack{1\leq i\leq d-1\\ i\neq q}}c_i\,\chi_{J_i}(u)\,\psi(u;s_1,\dots,s_{d-1})\,du\gtrsim c_p\,\Delta_p^{d-2}\prod_{\substack{1\leq i\leq d-1\\ i\neq p,q}}\Delta_i^{e_i-1}$$

and so

$$(3.1)\gtrsim c_p\,\big(\prod_{i=1}^{d-1}\Delta_i\big)\Delta_p^{d-2}\prod_{\substack{1\leq i\leq d-1\\ i\neq p,q}}\Delta_i^{e_i-1}=c_p\,\Delta_p^{d-1}\prod_{\substack{1\leq i\leq d-1\\ i\neq p}}\Delta_i^{e_i},$$

completing the proof of Lemma 2.1.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Lemma 2.2 is the statement that if

$$\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_k+k-1=r,$$

then **(a)** if $\ell_1>0$, $k\geq 2$, and $\mathcal{A}_r'$ is the collection of all permutations of r-tuples

$$(3.2)\quad r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\frac{1}{\ell_2+1}(1,\dots,\ell_2);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k);\underbrace{\frac{1}{2},\cdots,\frac{1}{2}}_{k-1\text{ times}}\Big),$$

we have $\mathcal{A}_r' \subset \mathcal{A}_r$ and **(b)** if $k \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{A}_r''$ is the collection of all permutations of r-tuples

$$r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1+1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k);\underbrace{\frac{1}{2},\cdots,\frac{1}{2}}_{k-2 \text{ times}};1\Big),$$

we have $\mathcal{A}_r'' \subset \mathcal{A}_r$. We will show these inclusions by induction on k. We require the following two facts, which we establish at the end of the proof of this lemma:

(3.3)

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+1}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-1});\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k)\Big) \in \Big(\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1}\Big)\mathcal{A}_{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k}$$

and

(3.4)

$$\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+1}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-1});\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k);\frac{1}{2}\Big) \in \Big(\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}\Big)\mathcal{A}_{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1}.$$

If $k=2$ and $\ell_1 > 1$, a vector (3.2) can be written

$$r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1}(1,\dots,\ell_1-1);1;\frac{1}{\ell_2+1}(1,\dots,\ell_2);\frac{1}{2}\Big),$$

and therefore, by (3.4), as a linear combination of permutations of vectors

$$r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1+\ell_2+1}(1,\dots,\ell_1+\ell_2);1\Big) \in \mathcal{A}_r.$$

And if $k=2$ and $\ell_1 = 1$, then (3.2) can be written

$$r\Big(1;\frac{1}{\ell_2+1}(1,\dots,\ell_2);\frac{1}{1+1}(1)\Big)$$

and therefore, by (3.3), as a linear combination of permutations of the vector

$$r\Big(1;\frac{1}{\ell_2+2}(1,\dots,\ell_2+1)\Big) \in \mathcal{A}_r.$$

Thus **(a)** holds for $k=2$. The fact that **(b)** holds for $k=2$, follows similarly from (3.3). So assume that $k \geq 3$ and that **(a)** and **(b)** hold with $k-1$ in place of k.

To show that **(b)** holds for k, fix a vector

(3.5)

$$r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1+1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+1}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-1});\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k);\underbrace{\frac{1}{2},\cdots,\frac{1}{2}}_{k-2 \text{ times}};1\Big)$$

in $\mathcal{A}_r''$. It follows from (3.4) that (3.5) can be written as a convex combination of permutations of vectors

(3.6)

$$r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1+1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_{k-2}+1}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-2});\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1);\underbrace{\frac{1}{2},\cdots,\frac{1}{2}}_{k-3 \text{ times}};1\Big),$$

and our induction assumption implies that each permutation of (3.6) is in $\mathcal{A}_r$. This establishes **(b)** for k.

To see that **(a)** holds for k, note that the argument above shows that a vector

$$r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+1}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-1});\frac{1}{\ell_k+1}(1,\dots,\ell_k);\underbrace{\frac{1}{2},\cdots,\frac{1}{2}}_{k-1\text{ times}}\Big)$$

of the form (3.2) can be written as a convex combination of permutations of vectors

$$r\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1}(1,\dots,\ell_1);\dots;\frac{1}{\ell_{k-2}+1}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-2});\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}(1,\dots,\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1);\underbrace{\frac{1}{2},\cdots,\frac{1}{2}}_{k-2\text{ times}}\Big),$$

and so, by the induction assumption, is in $\mathcal{A}_r$.

It remains to establish (3.3) and (3.4). We require an alternate description of $\mathcal{A}_r$. Let $\mathcal{A}_r^*$ be the set

$$\Big\{(a_1,\dots,a_r):\sum_{j=1}^{r}a_j=\frac{r(r+1)}{2}\text{ and }\sum_{j\in E}a_j\geq\frac{|E|(|E|+1)}{2}\text{ if }E\subset\{1,\dots,r\}\Big\}.$$

We want to show that $\mathcal{A}_r=\mathcal{A}_r^*$, and it is enough to show that each extreme point of the convex set $\mathcal{A}_r^*$ is a permutation of $(1,\dots,r)$. So assume that $(a_1,\dots,a_r)$ is an extreme point of $\mathcal{A}_r^*$. Without loss of generality we may also assume $a_1\leq a_2\leq\cdots\leq a_r$.

Our first step will be to show that

$$a_1<a_2<\cdots<a_d. \tag{3.7}$$

To this end, assume that $a_s=a_{s+1}$ for some $s\in\{1,\dots,d-1\}$. We will show that if either $s\in E, s+1\notin E$ or $s+1\in E, s\notin E$, then

$$\sum_{j\in E}a_j>\frac{|E|(|E|+1)}{2}. \tag{3.8}$$

If (3.8) holds, it will follow that there is $\delta>0$ such the vector obtained from $(a_1,\dots,a_r)$ by replacing a_s and a_{s+1} by $a_s+\eta$ and $a_{s+1}-\eta$ is in $\mathcal{A}_r$ whenever $|\eta|<\delta$. This implies that $(a_1,\dots,a_r)$ is not extreme. To show (3.8) we begin with an observation:

$$\text{if } a_k=a_{k+1},\ \text{then }\sum_{j=1}^{k}a_j>\frac{k(k+1)}{2}. \tag{3.9}$$

(To see (3.9), observe that the assumption $\sum_{j=1}^{k}a_j=\frac{k(k+1)}{2}$ and the inequality $\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}a_j\geq\frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$ together imply that $a_{k+1}\geq k+1$ and so $a_k\geq k+1$ if $a_k=a_{k+1}$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k}a_j=a_k+\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}a_j\geq(k+1)+\frac{(k-1)k}{2},$$

contradicting $\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$.) Returning to (3.8), we will write $k = |E|$ and consider three cases:

Case I ($k < s$): Here we will show that if $s \in E$ or $s+1 \in E$ then (3.8) holds. Assuming $s \in E$, it follows that

$$\frac{k(k+1)}{2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_j + a_k \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_j + a_s \leq \sum_{j \in E} a_j.$$

Thus if (3.8) fails, then $a_k = a_{k+1}$ (since $a_k = a_s$) and $\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j = k(k+1)/2$, contradicting (3.9). The case $s+1 \in E$ is similar.

Case II ($k = s$): We will just observe that if $a_s = a_{s+1}$, then (3.8) holds. In fact, since

$$\sum_{j \in E} a_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j,$$

this follows immediately from (3.9).

Case III ($k > s$): We will show that if either $s \notin E$ or $s+1 \notin E$ then (3.8) holds. Write $E = \{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k\}$ with $j_1 < \cdots < j_k$. Since $k > s$ and either $s \notin E$ or $s+1 \notin E$, it follows that $j_k > k$. Then, since $1 \leq j_1, \ldots, k \leq j_k$, the inequality

$$\frac{k(k+1)}{2} \leq \sum_{l=1}^{k} a_l \leq \sum_{l=1}^{k} a_{j_l} = \sum_{j \in E} a_j$$

shows that if (3.8) fails then $a_k = a_{j_k}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j = k(k+1)/2$, again resulting in a contradiction of (3.9). Thus (3.8), and so (3.7), are established.

Now suppose that $(a_1, \ldots, a_r)$ is extreme and (3.7) holds. If $a_j \geq j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, r$ then the condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_j = r(r+1)/2$$

forces $(a_1, \ldots, a_r) = (1, \ldots, r)$. But if we have $a_j < j$ for any j, we can choose t such that $a_t < t$ and that $a_j \geq j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, t-1$ (the condition $a_1 \geq 1$ implies that $t > 1$). Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t} a_j \geq t(t+1)/2 \tag{3.10}$$

we can choose s with $s \leq t-1$, $a_s > s$, and $a_j = j$ if $s < j < t$. Thus

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_r) = (a_1, \ldots, a_{s-1}, a_s, s+1, \ldots, t-1, a_t, a_{t+1}, \ldots, a_r).$$

It follows from (3.10) and $a_t < t$ that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_j > p(p+1)/2$$

for $p = s, \cdots, t-1$. Thus there is $\delta > 0$ such that if $|\eta| < \delta$, then

$$(a_1, \dots, a_{s-1}, a_s + \eta, s+1, \dots, t-1, a_t - \eta, a_{t+1}, \dots, a_r) \in \mathcal{A}_r^*, \tag{3.11}$$

where we have used the fact that (3.7) implies that the entries of the vector in (3.11) are nondecreasing if δ is small enough. Then $(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ cannot be an extreme point of $\mathcal{A}_r^*$. Thus $a_j \geq j$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$ and so $(a_1, \dots, a_r) = (1, \dots, r)$ as desired.

We return to the proofs for (3.3) and (3.4). Since $\mathcal{A}_{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k} = \mathcal{A}^*_{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k}$, (3.3) will follow from checking that if $m \leq \ell_{k-1}$ and $n \leq \ell_k$, then

$$\frac{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1}{\ell_{k-1}+1}\frac{m(m+1)}{2} + \frac{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1}{\ell_k+1}\frac{n(n+1)}{2} \geq \frac{(n+m)(n+m+1)}{2}. \tag{3.12}$$

This inequality is equivalent to the inequality

$$m(m+1)\ell_k(\ell_k+1) + n(n+1)\ell_{k-1}(\ell_{k-1}+1) \geq 2mn(\ell_{k-1}+1)(\ell_k+1). \tag{3.13}$$

And the easily checked inequality

$$\sqrt{m(m+1)n(n+1)\ell_{k-1}(\ell_{k-1}+1)\ell_k(\ell_k+1)} \geq mn(\ell_{k-1}+1)(\ell_k+1)$$

shows that (3.13) follows from the inequality between arithmetic and geometric means.

Similarly, to show that (3.4) holds it is enough to check that if $m \leq \ell_{k-1}$ and $n \leq \ell_k$, then the inequalities

$$\frac{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}{\ell_{k-1}+1}\ \frac{m(m+1)}{2} + \frac{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}{\ell_k+1}\ \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \geq \frac{(n+m)(n+m+1)}{2} \tag{3.14}$$

and

$$\frac{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}{\ell_{k-1}+1}\ \frac{m(m+1)}{2} + \frac{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}{\ell_k+1}\ \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}{2} \geq \frac{(n+m+1)(n+m+2)}{2} \tag{3.15}$$

hold. Since (3.14) follows from (3.12), it is enough to establish (3.15). Now inequality (3.12) is equivalent to

$$\frac{m(m+1)}{2(\ell_{k-1}+1)} + \frac{n(n+1)}{2(\ell_k+1)} \geq \frac{(n+m)(n+m+1)}{2(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1)},$$

while (3.15) is equivalent to

$$\frac{m(m+1)}{2(\ell_{k-1}+1)} + \frac{n(n+1)}{2(\ell_k+1)} + \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{(n+m+1)(n+m+2)}{2(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2)} =$$

$$\Big(\frac{(n+m)(n+m+1)}{2} + (n+m+1)\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1} - \frac{1}{(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1)(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2)}\Big).$$

Thus it is enough to show that

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{(n+m)(n+m+1)}{2(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1)(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2)} + \frac{n+m+1}{(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1)(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2)} \geq \frac{n+m+1}{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1}.$$

This is equivalent to the inequality

$$(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1)+\frac{(n+m+1)(n+m+2)}{\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2}\geq 2(n+m+1)$$

which follows from the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality and the easily checked

$$(n+m+1)(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+2)\leq(\ell_{k-1}+\ell_k+1)(n+m+2),$$

itself a consequence of $m\leq\ell_{k-1}$, $n\leq\ell_k$.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Recall that $c_n\leq t_{p_{n-1}+1}<\cdots<t_{p_n}\leq d_n$ and that $W_n=W(t_{p_{n-1}+1},\ldots,t_{p_n})$. It follows that $W_n\lesssim\delta_n^{\ell_n(\ell_n+1)/2}$ and so

$$m_{d-k}\big(\{\mathbf{t}:W_1^{d/(\ell_1+1)}\prod_{n=2}^k W_n^{(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\leq\mu\}\big)\lesssim$$

(3.16)

$$\sum_{2^{p_2}\leq\delta_2^{\ell_2(\ell_2+1)/2}}\cdots\sum_{2^{p_k}\leq\delta_k^{\ell_k(\ell_k+1)/2}}\prod_{n=2}^k\Big|\{W_n\leq 2^{p_n}\}\Big|\cdot\Big|\{W_1\leq\big(\mu/\prod_{n=2}^k 2^{p_n(d-1)/(\ell_n+1)}\big)^{(\ell_1+1)/d}\}\Big|,$$

where

$$|\{W_n\leq\lambda\}|=m_{\ell_n}\big(\{(t_{p_{n-1}+2},\ldots,t_{p_n}):W(t_{p_{n-1}+1},t_{p_{n-1}+2},\ldots,t_{p_n})\leq\lambda\}\big).$$

We will need the estimate

$$|\{W_n\leq\lambda\}|\lesssim\lambda^{2/(\ell_n+1)}. \tag{3.17}$$

To show (3.17) and, more generally, to show that

(3.18)

$$m_p\big(\{(s_1,\ldots,s_p):0\leq s_1\leq\cdots\leq s_p:W(0,s_1,\ldots,s_p)\leq\lambda\}\big)\leq C(p)\,\lambda^{2/(p+1)},$$

we will argue by induction on p. (Inequality (3.18) is an analog of a result, Proposition 2.4 (i) in [1], from [5] and [6].) The case $p=1$ is clear, so assume that (3.18) holds. If we make the change of variable

$$u_1=s_1,u_2=s_2-s_1,\ldots,u_p=s_p-s_{p-1},$$

then

$$m_p\big(\{(s_1,\ldots,s_p):0\leq s_1\leq\cdots\leq s_p,\,W(0,s_1,\ldots,s_p)\leq\lambda\}\big)=$$

$$p!\,m_p\big(\{(u_1,\ldots,u_p):0\leq u_1\leq\cdots\leq u_p,\,\prod_{j=1}^p(u_j)^j\leq\lambda\}\big).$$

Now

$$m_{p+1}\big(\{(u_1,\ldots,u_{p+1}):0\leq u_1\leq\cdots\leq u_{p+1},\,\prod_{j=1}^{p+1}(u_j)^j\leq\lambda\}\big)=$$

$$\int_0^\infty m_p\big(\{(u_1,\ldots,u_p):0\leq u_1\leq\cdots\leq u_p\leq u_{p+1},\,\prod_{j=1}^p u_j^j\leq\lambda/(u_{p+1})^{p+1}\}\big)\,du_{p+1}.$$

Thus the estimate

$$m_p\big(\{(u_1,\dots,u_p) : 0 \le u_1 \le \cdots \le u_{p+1}, \prod_{j=1}^{p}(u_j)^j \le \lambda/(u_{p+1})^{p+1}\}\big) \le$$

$$C(p)\,\min\{(u_{p+1})^p, (\lambda/(u_{p+1})^{p+1})^{2/(p+1}\},$$

a consequence of (3.18), shows that (3.18) holds with p replaced by $p+1$.

Now, using (3.17) and some algebra, we have

$$(3.16) \lesssim \mu^{2/d} \sum_{2^{p_2} \le \delta_2^{\ell_2(\ell_2+1)/2}} \cdots \sum_{2^{p_k} \le \delta_k^{\ell_k(\ell_k+1)/2}} \prod_{n=2}^{k} 2^{2p_n/[d(\ell_n+1])} \lesssim \mu^{2/d} \prod_{n=2}^{k} \delta_n^{\ell_n/d}.$$

This gives the desired conclusion and therefore completes the proof of Lemma 2.3.

References

[1] J.-G. Bak, D. Oberlin, A. Seeger, Restriction of Fourier transforms to curves and related oscillatory integrals, *Amer. J. Math.*, to appear.

[2] ———, Restriction of Fourier transforms to curves II: some classes with vanishing curvature, *J. Australian Math. Soc*, to appear.

[3] M. Christ, On the restriction of the Fourier transform to curves: endpoint results and the degenerate case, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **287** (1985), 223–238.

[4] S. Dendrinos and J. Wright, Fourier restriction to polynomial curves I: a geometric inequality, preprint.

[5] S.W. Drury, B. Marshall, Fourier restriction theorems for curves with affine and Euclidean arclengths, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **97** (1985), 111–125.

[6] ———, Fourier restriction theorems for degenerate curves, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **101** (1987), 541–553.

[7] D. Oberlin, Fourier restriction estimates for affine arclength measure in the plane, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **129** (2001), 3303–3305.

[8] ———, Some convolution inequalities and their applications, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **354** (2001), 2541–2556.

[9] P. Sjölin, Fourier multipliers and estimates of the Fourier transform of measures carried by smooth curves in R^2, *Studia Math.*, **51** (1974), 169–182.

D. M. Oberlin, Department of Mathematics, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306

E-mail address: `oberlin@math.fsu.edu`